

### **Remarks/Arguments**

#### ***Claim Summary***

Claims 22, 24, 25 are amended. Claims 23 and 27 are canceled. New claims 30-39 are added.

Claims 22, 24-26, and 28-39 are pending in the application.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants acknowledge with thanks the indicated allowable subject matter of dependent claim 27.

#### ***Specification***

Applicants have amended the specification to update the continuity data.

#### ***IDS***

The Applicants assume that the Examiner is questioning US patent numbers 5,759,892 and 5,081,068, and not 5,795,892 and 5,091,068, respectively.

These two (2) patents in addition to other documents were submitted as an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) with Form PTO-1449 on August 2, 2003, for the parent application, now USP 6,701,942, of the present application. The two (2) patents in question were cited by the Korean Examiner during the prosecution of the Korean priority application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103***

Claims 22, 26, and 29 were rejected under §102(b) as being anticipated by Rose et al. (US 5,967,156).

The Examiner alleges that Rose et al. anticipates all the limitations of claims 22, 26 and 29. For support, the Examiner cites column 5, lines 31-46 and column 13, lines 10-20. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's §102(b) rejection.

The entire patent must be reviewed to fully comprehend the invention. Specifically, the Rose et al. patent contains eight (8) independent claims. The independent claims contain a common feature, that is, a flow of fluid and a delivery of a second source occur simultaneously. Column 7, lines 49-62. In other words, the key concept of the Rose et al. patent lies in the requirement that both chemical and physical processes are simultaneously performed.

Independent claim 22 of the present application recite that irradiating a surface and jetting of aerosol occur in a discrete manner and at a separate time. Accordingly, Rose et al. does not anticipate claims 22, 26, and 29, because Rose et al. discloses a simultaneous process.

Claims 23 and 25 were rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rose et al.

The Examiner alleges that Rose et al. discloses all the feature of claims 23 and 25, except:

“Rose does not specifically indicate that the chemical processing [and] the physical cleaning are performed in different cleaning chambers.”

Further to the remarks made above in regards to the Examiner’s §102(b) rejection against claim 22, the Applicants submit that claim 25, which depends on claim 22, defines also over Rose et al. Also, claim 23 has been canceled, thus mooting the Examiner rejection.

Claim 24 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rose et al. in view of JP3-159237.

The Applicants submit that independent claim 22 defines over Rose et al. as remark above; therefore, claim 24, which depends on claim 22, define over the Examiner’s cited references individually or in combination thereof.

Claim 28 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rose et al. in view of Swain et al. (US 5,125,979).

The Applicants submit that independent claim 22 defines over Rose et al. as remark above; therefore, claim 28, which depends on claim 22, define over the Examiner’s cited references individually or in combination thereof.

New independent claim 30 incorporates the content of canceled claim 23 with original claim 22. For the reason given above to traverse the Examiner’s §102(b) rejection against claim 22, the Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 30 defines over the Examiner’s reference individually or in combination thereof. Claims 31-35, which depends on claim 30, define over the Examiner’s reference individually or in combination thereof for the same stated reasons.

New independent claim 36 incorporates the allowable subject matter of canceled claim 27 with original claim 22. Claims 36-39, which are dependent claims, are also allowable.

For at least the reasons given above, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 22, 24-26, and 28-39 are allowable.

***Conclusion***

No other issues remain, reconsideration and favorable action upon claims 22, 24-26, and 28-39 present in the application are requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Volentine Francos & Whitt, PLLC



Linus Y. Park  
Reg. No. 45,261

Date: June 1, 2005

One Freedom Square  
Suite 1260  
11951 Freedom Drive  
Reston, VA 20190  
Tel. (571) 283-0720  
Fax (571) 283-0740